arXiv:1604.04855v2 [cs.DM] 22 Mar 2017

Fault tolerant supergraphs with automorphisms

Ashwin Ganesan*

Abstract

Given a basic graph Y and a desired level of fault-tolerance k, an objective in fault-tolerant system design is to construct a supergraph X such that the removal of any k nodes from X leaves a graph containing Y. In order to reconfigure around faults when they occur, it is also required that any two subsets of k nodes of X are in the same orbit of the action of its automorphism group. In this paper, we prove that such a supergraph must be the complete graph. This implies that it is very expensive to have an interconnection network which is k-fault-tolerant and which also supports automorphic reconfiguration. Our work resolves an open problem in the literature. The proof uses a result due to Cameron on k-homogeneous groups.

Index terms — interconnection networks; fault-tolerant system design; structural fault tolerance; graph automorphisms; graph theory; permutation groups.

1. Introduction

The interconnection network of a computing system is modeled as a graph $X = (V, E)$ whose vertices correspond to processors and with two vertices being adjacent whenever the corresponding two processors are connected by a direct communication link (cf. [13], [15]). In order to execute an algorithm on this computing system, it is required that the architecture X contain a given *basic graph* Y as a subgraph. If some of the nodes of X become faulty, in order to continue operation it is required that the functioning part of the network still contain the basic graph Y. We assume the basic graph Y is nonempty, i.e. it contains at least one edge. Any notation or terminology on graphs which we use in this paper is standard [2].

Let Y be a nonempty graph on n vertices. A graph X is said to be a *k-fault-tolerant realization of Y* if X can be obtained from Y by adding a set of k new vertices (called *spare nodes*) and some edges so that the resulting graph X has the property that the removal of any k vertices from X leaves a graph which still contains Y (cf. [6]). In other words, X is a k-fault-tolerant realization of Y if X has $n + k$ vertices and $X - W$ contains a subgraph isomorphic to Y for each k-subset $W \subseteq V(X)$. In this

*School of Computing and Information Technology, Manipal University Jaipur, Rajasthan 303007, India. Email: ashwin.ganesan@gmail.com.

case, if any k nodes of X become faulty, the network corresponding to the nonfaulty nodes of X contains the architecture Y and hence can continue to operate. In this sense, the architecture X can tolerate up to k node failures.

A graph X is a *supergraph* of Y if it is possible to add vertices and edges to Y to obtain X, ie if $V(Y) \subseteq V(X)$ and $E(Y) \subseteq E(X)$. A graph X is an *edge-supergraph* of Y if $V(X) = V(Y)$ and $E(Y) \subseteq E(X)$. In this paper, we consider the method of constructing supergraphs X of a given graph Y such that for all k-subsets $F \subseteq V(X)$, $X - F$ contains the subgraph Y. This type of design method is called *global sparing* because the k spare nodes added to Y are associated with all of $V(Y)$. In local sparing, we would partition $V(Y)$ into t subsets $V_1, \ldots, V_t$ (for some $t \geq 2$) and associate t sets of spare nodes to the t subsets V_i, respectively. Local sparing simplifies the design and reconfiguration process, while global sparing achieves k-fault-tolerance with fewer processors.

Before stating our main result, we need to recall some terminology on group actions [5] and automorphisms of graphs [12]. Many authors have investigated the use of algebraic methods in interconnection networks; see the surveys [14], [9] and the references therein. The present paper investigates an open problem posed in [6] on fault-tolerant supergraphs whose automorphism group satisfies certain properties. Another research area at the interface of graph automorphisms and interconnection networks is the study of the structure of interconnection network topologies; for example, several authors have investigated the automorphism group of graphs that arise as the topology of interconnection networks [4] [7] [8] [10] [11] [16].

Let G be a group and let Ω be a nonempty set. Suppose the map $\mu : \Omega \times G \to \Omega, (\alpha, x) \mapsto \alpha^x$ satisfies the following two conditions: (i) $(\alpha^x)^y = \alpha^{xy}$, for all $\alpha \in \Omega$ and all $x, y \in G$, and (ii) $\alpha^1 = \alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \Omega$, where 1 denotes the identity element of the group G. Then, we say that this map defines an *action* of G on Ω and that G *acts* on Ω. This action naturally induces a homomorphism from G into $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$, and conversely, every homomorphism from G into $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ induces an action of G on Ω. The orbit of a point $\alpha \in \Omega$ under this action is the set $\alpha^G := \{\alpha^x : x \in G\}$. Thus, the action of G on Ω partitions Ω into orbits. The action of G on Ω is *transitive* if for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega$, there exists a $g \in G$ such that $\alpha^g = \beta$; equivalently, G acts transitively on Ω if the action of G on Ω has a single orbit.

Suppose G acts on Ω. The action of G on Ω induces an action of G on the set of all subsets of Ω by the rule $\Gamma^x := \{\gamma^x : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$, for all $\Gamma \subseteq \Omega$. It is clear that the set $\Omega^{\{k\}}$ of all k-subsets of Ω is G-invariant. The group G is said to be *k-homogeneous* if G acts on $\Omega^{\{k\}}$ transitively. (What we call k-homogeneous in this paper is referred to as k-subtransitive in [6].) Let $\Omega^{(k)}$ denote the set of all k-tuples of distinct elements from Ω. We say that G is *k-transitive* if G acts transitively on $\Omega^{(k)}$. It is clear that if G is k-transitive, then G is k-homogeneous; the converse is not true in general. For further details on group actions, we refer the reader to [5, Chapter 1]; for a discussion of k-homogeneous groups, see [5, Sections 2.1 and 9.4].

Let $X = (V, E)$ be a simple, undirected graph. Let $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$ denote the full symmetric group acting on the vertex set $V = V(X)$. Then, $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$ acts naturally on the set $V^{\{2\}}$ of all 2-subsets of V. An *automorphism* of the graph $X = (V, E)$ is a permutation $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(V)$ which preserves adjacency and nonadjacency. In other

words, $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(V)$ is an automorphism of X if $\{x, y\} \in E$ iff $\{x, y\}^g \in E$. The set of all automorphisms of X forms a permutation group, called the *automorphism group of* X, denoted by $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$. Thus, $\mathrm{Aut}(X) := \{g \in \mathrm{Sym}(V) : E^g = E\}$. A graph X is said to be *vertex-transitive* if its automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ acts transitively on the vertex set $V(X)$.

Having stated our terminology on group actions and automorphisms of graphs, we can now describe an approach for restructuring around faults in an interconnection network. This approach, called automorphic reconfiguration, was introduced in [6], and refers to a specific type of reconfiguration using automorphisms in which the k spare nodes are directly mapped to the set of k faulty nodes. Automorphic reconfiguration, as defined in [6], is an impractical way of designing and reconfiguring graphs (and in particular, multiprocessor networks), and was a definition given just for theoretical purposes to finally lead to the type of k-fault-tolerant supergraphs designed in [6] that are not complete graphs.

In order to achieve so-called *automorphic reconfiguration* (cf. [6, p.253]), it is required that, when (k or fewer) nodes of the interconnection network become faulty, there exists an automorphism of the graph X that maps the spare nodes to the faulty nodes. In graph-theoretic terms, the interconnection topology X must satisfy the property that if A and B are any two k-subsets of $V(X)$, then there is an automorphism of X that maps A to B. Equivalently, the interconnection network topology X must satisfy the property that its automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is k-homogeneous.

Thus, our objective is the following: given a basic graph Y and a desired level of fault-tolerance k, construct a graph X such that X is a k-fault-tolerant realization of Y and such that $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is k-homogeneous. In other words, given a basic graph Y, we add k spare nodes S to $V(Y)$ and edges to get a supergraph X such that for any k-subset $F \subseteq V(X)$ of faulty nodes, there exists an automorphism $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ such that $S^g = F$ and such that the set of nonfaulty nodes contains the subgraph Y. Dutt and Hayes settled this problem for the case $k = 2$ by proving the following result:

Theorem 1. *[6, Theorem 2] If Y is a nonempty graph, X is a 2-fault-tolerant realization of Y and $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is 2-homogeneous, then X is the complete graph.*

Dutt and Hayes (cf. [6, p. 253]) posed the problem of generalizing the $k = 2$ result of Theorem 1 to arbitrary k. In this paper, we resolve this open problem (cf. Theorem 2 below).

The following is the main result of this paper:

Theorem 2. *Let $k \geq 2$. If Y is a nonempty graph, X is a k-fault-tolerant realization of Y and $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is k-homogeneous, then X is the complete graph.*

2. Preliminaries

We shall use the following result in the sequel.

Lemma 3. *[1, Chapter 15, p. 118] Let X be a graph containing at least one edge. Then, X is the complete graph if and only if $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is 2-homogeneous.*

Proof: If X is the complete graph, then $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is the full symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$. Given any two 2-subsets $\{a,b\},\{c,d\} \in V^{\{2\}}$, there exists a permutation in $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$ which takes a to c and b to d. Hence, $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is 2-homogeneous. For the converse, suppose $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is 2-homogeneous. Recall that X has at least one edge, say $\{a,b\} \in E(X)$. Let u,v be any two distinct vertices of X. By hypothesis, there exists an automorphism $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ that maps $\{a,b\}$ to $\{u,v\}$. Since g is an automorphism, g preserves adjacency, whence $\{u,v\} \in E(X)$. Thus, every pair of vertices of X is adjacent and X is the complete graph. ∎

We now recall and prove Theorem 1.

Theorem 4. *[6, Theorem 2] Let Y be a nonempty graph on n vertices. Let X be a 2-fault-tolerant realization of Y and suppose $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is 2-homogeneous. Then, $X \cong K_{n+2}$.*

Proof: By the definition of 2-fault-tolerant-realization, $|V(X)| = n+2$. Also, X contains Y as a subgraph, whence X contains at least one edge. The assertion now follows from Lemma 3. ∎

We now recall some results on permutation groups [5]. Their proofs are straightforward and we omit the details.

Lemma 5. *Suppose G acts on Ω and $|\Omega| = n$. If G is k-homogeneous, then G is $(n-k)$-homogeneous.*

Lemma 6. *Suppose G acts on Ω. If G is k-transitive, then G is k-homogeneous.*

We briefly mention some further results on permutation groups. While k-transitive implies k-homogeneous, the converse is not true in general. For example, the two permutations (1234567) and (235)(476) generate a permutation group in S_7 which is 2-homogeneous but not 2-transitive [5, p. 286]. The symmetric group S_n is n-transitive and in fact is k-transitive and k-homogeneous for all $k = 1,2,\ldots,n$. If a permutation group is k-transitive, then it is $(k-1)$-transitive. A group which is k-homogeneous need not be $(k-1)$-homogeneous. However, it will follow from our main result that if the permutation group arises as the automorphism group of a graph, then k-homogeneous does imply $(k-1)$-homogeneous.

3. Main results

We first extend the results of Lemma 3 and Theorem 4 from the 2-homogeneous case to the 3-homogeneous case. This result is actually a special case of the main result (Theorem 9 below). We now give an elementary proof for the 3-homogeneous case which does not use the theory of permutation groups. In fact, the condition that $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ be 3-homogeneous can be replaced by the weaker condition that every subset of 3 vertices of the graph induces the same subgraph.

Theorem 7. *If X is a graph on 5 or more vertices containing at least one edge and $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is 3-homogeneous, then X is the complete graph.*

Proof: Let $A = \{a, b, c\} \subseteq V(X)$ and let X' denote the induced subgraph $X[A]$. Because $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is 3-homogeneous, every 3-subset of $V(X)$ induces the same subgraph X'. By hypothesis, X' contains at least one edge. We consider three cases for the structure of X'. For the first case, suppose X' is a 3-clique. Then, X is the complete graph because every subset of 3 vertices of X induces a 3-clique. For the second case, suppose X' is isomorphic to $K_{1,2}$. Without loss of generality, suppose $ab, bc \in E(X), ac \notin E(X)$. Let $x, w \in V(X) - A$. Then, $\{a, c, w\}$ and $\{a, c, x\}$ each induce a $K_{1,2}$. Since a and c are nonadjacent, it must be that $ax, cx, aw, cw \in E(X)$. The subgraph induced by $\{b, x, w\}$ must also be a $K_{1,2}$ and hence contains at least one edge. The endpoints of this edge along with vertex a induce a K_3, a contradiction. Hence, the second case is impossible.

For the third case, suppose that X' is isomorphic to the disjoint union of K_2 and K_1. Hence, X' contains exactly one edge. Without loss of generality, suppose $ab \in E(X)$ and $ac, bc \notin E(X)$. Let $w \in V(X) - A$. The subgraph of X induced by $\{a, b, w\}$ contains exactly one edge. Since $ab \in E(X)$, we have that $aw, bw \notin E(X)$. The subgraph induced by $\{a, c, w\}$ contains exactly one edge, whence $cw \in E(X)$. Thus, every pair of vertices in $V(X) - \{a, b\}$ induces an edge. In particular, if $w, x \in V(X) - A$, then $\{c, w, x\}$ induces a K_3, a contradiction. Thus, the third case is also impossible. ∎

Our proof of the main result uses the following result due to Cameron:

Theorem 8. *[3, Theorem 2.2] [5, Theorem 9.4A] Let G be a permutation group acting on a set Ω. Let m, k be integers with $0 \leq m \leq k$ and $m + k \leq |\Omega|$. Then, G has at least as many orbits in $\Omega^{\{k\}}$ as it has in $\Omega^{\{m\}}$.*

We now prove the main result.

Theorem 9. *Let $k \geq 2$. If Y is a nonempty graph, X is a k-fault-tolerant realization of Y and $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is k-homogeneous, then X is the complete graph.*

Proof: The case $k = 2$ is addressed in Theorem 4, so assume $k \geq 3$. Let Y be a graph on n vertices. Here, $n \geq 2$ since Y contains at least one edge. Note that X is a graph on $n + k$ vertices. Let $G = \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ and let $\Omega = V(X)$. By hypothesis, the action of G on the set Ω is k-homogeneous. Thus, the number of orbits of G on $\Omega^{\{k\}}$ is 1. Since $2 \leq n$, $2 + k \leq n + k = |\Omega|$. Also, $2 \leq k$. Hence, by Theorem 8, the number of orbits of G on $\Omega^{\{2\}}$ is also 1. Equivalently, the action of G on Ω is 2-homogeneous. By Lemma 3, X is the complete graph. ∎

In the proof above, we essentially showed the following:

Corollary 10. *Let $k \geq 2$. Let X be a nonempty graph on $k + 2$ vertices. If $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is k-homogeneous, then X is the complete graph.*

As stated, Theorem 9 assumes that the order $|V(X)|$ of X is exactly equal to $n + k$. The proof of the theorem goes through even if this condition is relaxed to $|V(X)| \geq n + k$:

Corollary 11. *Let X be a nonempty graph. If* $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ *is k-homogeneous for some $2 \leq k \leq |V(X)| - 2$, then* $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ *is 2-homogeneous and X is the complete graph.*

We resolve some further open questions in the literature. In [6, p. 252], it is stated that there is likely no characterization of k-homogeneous automorphism groups of graphs in the literature. In [6, p. 252], it is mentioned that k-homogeneity of $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ could be a "significantly weaker restriction" than k-transitivity of $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$. Also, in [6, p.253], it is mentioned that k-homogeneity of $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ does not necessarily imply i-homogeneity of $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ for $2 \leq i \leq k-1$. All these questions are resolved by the following immediate consequence of our main result Theorem 9:

Corollary 12. *Let X be a graph on 4 or more vertices. Suppose $2 \leq k \leq |V(X)|-2$. If* $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ *is k-homogeneous, then* $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ *is i-homogeneous for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$ and* $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ *is the full symmetric group. In particular, k-homogeneity of* $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ *is equivalent to k-transitivity of* $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$.

The bounds in $2 \leq k \leq |V(X)| - 2$ are tight - there are many families of vertex-transitive graphs for which $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is k-homogeneous for $k = 1$ (and hence also for $k = |V(X)| - 1$ by Lemma 5, and obviously for $k = |V(X)|$) and such that $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is not i-homogeneous for $i = 2, \ldots, |V(X)| - 2$. For example, take X to be the cycle graph.

Theorem 9 makes two assumptions: that X is a k-fault-tolerant realization of Y and that $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is k-homogeneous. The conclusion of the theorem follows mainly from the second assumption and only a weak consequence of the first assumption is used. To illustrate, we consider the following example of a graph X which is a 2-fault-tolerant realization of $Y = Q_3$, the 3-dimensional cube. As this example shows, the first assumption alone is not sufficient to ensure that X is the complete graph.

Proposition 13. *Let Y be the 3-dimensional hypercube Q_3. Let X be the graph obtained by adding to Y two spare nodes x_1 and x_2 and joining each x_i ($i = 1, 2$) to each vertex of Y. Then, X is a 2-fault-tolerant realization of Y, but* $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ *is not k-homogeneous for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, |V(X)| - 1$.*

Proof: To prove that X is a 2-fault-tolerant realization of $Y = Q_3$, let $F = \{f_1, f_2\}$ be a set of two faulty nodes of X. We need to show that $X - F$ contains a subgraph isomorphic to Q_3. This is clear if $\{f_1, f_2\} = \{x_1, x_2\}$ and also if exactly one of the faulty nodes is in Y because this node can be replaced by the non-faulty spare node. So suppose now that both faulty nodes f_1 and f_2 are in Y. If f_1 and f_2 are nonadjacent in Y, then they can be replaced by the spare nodes x_1 and x_2, respectively, and $Y - F$ contains a subgraph isomorphic to Q_3. Finally, suppose f_1 and f_2 are adjacent nodes of Y. We show that $X - F$ contains a copy of Q_3. Observe that if any two diametrically opposite vertices of the 3-cube are removed, the resulting graph is a 6-cycle graph. Adding two new vertices to this 6-cycle graph and joining these two vertices to each vertex of the 6-cycle gives an edge-supergraph of Q_3. Similarly, because $Y - F$ contains a 6-cycle, adding two new vertices to $Y - F$ and joining them to each vertex of $Y - F$ gives an edge supergraph of Q_3. This proves that $Y - F$ contains a copy of Q_3.

In the graph X, the degree of vertex x_i $(i = 1, 2)$ is 8, and the degree of each of the remaining vertices is 4. Hence, X is not vertex-transitive (ie $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is not 1-homogeneous). By Lemma 5, $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is not $(|V(X)| - 1)$-homogeneous. If $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is k-homogeneous for some $2 \leq k \leq |V(X)| - 2$, then by Theorem 9 X is the complete graph, a contradiction. Hence, $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is not k-homogeneous if $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |V(X)| - 1\}$. ∎

Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 imply that it is very expensive to have an interconnection network which is k-fault-tolerant and which also supports automorphic reconfiguration because such an interconnection network must be the complete graph. The paper [6] designed an iterative reconfiguration technique which after k faults occur uses k different automorphisms in a repeated manner to obtain a fault-free graph isomorphic to the basic graph Y from its k-fault-tolerant supergraph X that does not require X to be a complete graph, and in fact is quite efficient in the additional edges needed in X with respect to Y (cf. [6, Theorems 5 and 6]) as well as in the switch-based implementation of X.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to the anonymous reviewers for helpful comments.

References

[1] N. L. Biggs. *Algebraic Graph Theory, 2nd Edition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[2] B. Bollobás. *Modern Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol. 184, Springer, New York, 1998.

[3] P. J. Cameron. Transitivity of permutation groups on unordered sets. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 148:127–139, 1976.

[4] Y.-P. Deng and X.-D. Zhang. Automorphism groups of the pancake graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 112:264–266, 2012.

[5] J. D. Dixon and B. Mortimer. *Permutation Groups*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol. 163, Springer, 1996.

[6] S. Dutt and J. P. Hayes. Designing fault-tolerant systems using graph automorphisms. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, 12:249–268, 1991.

[7] Y-Q. Feng. Automorphism groups of Cayley graphs on symmetric groups with generating transposition sets. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B*, 96:67–72, 2006.

[8] A. Ganesan. Automorphism groups of Cayley graphs generated by connected transposition sets. *Discrete Mathematics*, 313:2482–2485, 2013.

[9] A. Ganesan. Cayley graphs and symmetric interconnection networks. In *Proceedings of the Pre-Conference Workshop on Algebraic and Applied Combinatorics (31st Annual Conference of the Ramanujan Mathematical Society), Trichy, Tamilnadu, India*, pages 118–170, 2016.

[10] A. Ganesan. Edge-transitivity of Cayley graphs generated by transpositions. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory*, 36:1035–1042, 2016.

[11] A. Ganesan. Automorphism group of the complete transposition graph. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 42(3):793–801, November 2015.

[12] C. Godsil and G. Royle. *Algebraic Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol. 207, Springer, New York, 2001.

[13] J. P. Hayes. A graph model for fault-tolerant computing systems. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, C-25(9):875–884, 1976.

[14] M. C. Heydemann. Cayley graphs and interconnection networks. In *Graph symmetry: algebraic methods and applications (Editors: Hahn and Sabidussi)*, pages 167–226. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1997.

[15] F. T. Leighton. *Introduction to parallel algorithms and architectures: arrays, trees, hypercubes*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, 1992.

[16] M. Wan and Z. Zhang. A kind of conditional vertex-connectivity of star graphs. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 22:264–267, 2009.